



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,273	11/20/2001	William Robert Hanson	035451-0145 (3682.Palm)	9592
26371	7590	04/05/2004	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER 777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 3800 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308			SAWHNEY, HARGOBIND S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 09/989,273	Applicant(s) HANSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Hargobind S Sawhney	Art Unit 2875	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 08 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See continuity sheet
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## Continuation Sheet

The Request for Reconsideration filed on December 8, 2003 to the final rejection has been considered but is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance because applicant's arguments were not convincing.

Chen ('092) discloses a reflective layer 50- herewith also considered as a light converter having a fluorescent surface reflecting the invisible light from the light source 40, and converting the invisible light into light visible to human eyes. As the light converter 50 is in optical contact with the reflective layer 30 both the light converter and the reflective layer have been reconsidered operationally and optically integral. Further, flexible displays are well known in the art including Arledge et al. (US Patent No.: 5,436,744).

## Additional Information:

Chen ('092) discloses a reflective layer having a fluorescent coating instead of a phosphorescent coating in a substrate as claimed by the applicant. On the other hand, Baur et al. ('781) discloses an electro-optical display device (Figure 9) comprising a fluorescent plate 1a, and an additional a layer 25 containing phosphorescent particles (Figure 9, column 9, lines 5-10). Baur et al. ('781) further teaches the phosphorescent particles embedded in the layer metallic coating (Column 8, lines 17-20).

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the lighting system of Chen ('092) by providing the layer containing phosphorescent particles as taught by Baur et al. ('781) for the benefits and advantages of providing afterglow of the display after the device in switched-off.

Further, regarding Claim 1, Chen ('092) teaches the disclosed light source useable for a liquid crystal display (LCD) (Figure 1 and abstract). However, Chan does not disclose specific features of the LCD.

On the other hand, Umemoto et al. ('409 B1) discloses a planer light source 11 (Figures 3 and 4) with a display layer 3 (Figure 3, column 15, lines 5-7) inherently having its pixels altered with an application of electric charge.

It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine lighting system of Chen ('092) in view of Baur et al. ('781) with the display layer - LCD- and it positioning as taught by Umemoto for the benefits and advantage of providing a display system with a lighting system having long operational life, energy efficiency and steady illumination.



**THOMAS M. SEMBER**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**